CPSA 6 (b)(1) Gleared
No Miles/Prytibles on

Firms Notified

Comments Processed.

 $-iM^{\dagger}$

LOG OF MEETING

SUBJECT: ASTM Subcommittee F15.45 on Candle Products

DATE OF MEETING: January 8, 1999

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: February 23, 1999

PERSON SUBMITTING LOG: James F. Hoebel

LOCATION: Harbor Court Hotel, Baltimore, MD

CPSC ATTENDEE(S): James F. Hoebel, Engineering Sciences

Margaret Neily, Engineering Sciences

NON-CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Approximately 40 Subcommittee members and guests. ASTM will provide roster when they distribute their minutes

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The Agenda is attached. The meeting was called to order by the Subcommittee Chairman, Thomas Kreilick, at 9:10 am. After self introductions, the minutes of the April 17, 1998, meeting were approved without change. Kathie Morgan of ASTM reported that the F15.45 Subcommittee was the largest Subcommittee of the F15 Committee on Consumer products.

The Data Evaluation Task Group report was provided by Dr. Edward Heiden. Based on data from NFIRS and NEISS, he reported that fire incidents have increased since his last report in April. However, there has been no appreciable change in the observed factors associated with candle fires (location, item ignited first, ignition factor, etc.). The increase in fire incidents was attributed to increased sales and usage of candles. Dr. Heiden noted that the comments included in NEISS reports were not too useful, and "need to be tightened up." He observed that there seems to be fewer CPSC Section 15 recalls.

The Terminology Task Group report was provided by George Pappas. They have had difficulty in developing a precise definition of "wax." They have consulted with the ASTM Committee on Wax, who have had the same problem. This has made it impossible to define "candle." This has resulted in a delay in the activities of the labeling task group who felt that they could not process a labeling standard until "candle" had been defined. A negative vote on the proposed Terminology Standard's definition of wax was voted to be non-persuasive 18-8. Some other objections were withdrawn, and the definition of wax was expanded to include synthetic wax. Mr. Pappas felt that the Task group would be able to prepare an acceptable Terminology Standard, so a new ballot should be issued shortly.

John Root, Chairman of the Labeling Task Group, cited two CPSC comments on the Labeling Standard draft (both attributed to Carolyn Meiers). Mr. Hoebel stated a concern that the current labeling standard draft specified only three important safety messages, and that some manufacturers who now have more extensive and effective labeling might reduce the amount of safety information in order to be in conformance with the labeling described in the standard. Therefore, the following language was proposed: "The messages specified in 5.2.5 represent minimum safety language requirements. Additional appropriate safety messages are encouraged." The Subcommittee approved the addition to the standard unanimously. The other issue related to the minimum label dimensions of 1 cm by 2¼ cm, which is so small that the label might be illegible. Subcommittee discussion stated that most tea-light candles could only be labeled on the container bottom which had only that amount of room. Examples of conforming labels were passed around to illustrate the situation. The Subcommittee decided to maintain the current minimum size requirement. Ms. Freeston was concerned that section 5.1.1 imposed a requirement on the distributor or retailer not to cover, obstruct, or remove the label. This goes beyond the responsibilities of the manufacturer.

The Subcommittee Chairman then considered new Task Groups. He established two new Task Groups to develop test requirements for a performance test standard: one on sooting and one on glass containers. The glass container Task Group would address glass breakage and thermal resistance, and be co-chaired by a representative of a candle manufacturer and a representative of a glass manufacturer. He hoped to form this Task Group in about two weeks, and they would develop objectives in two months. The sooting Task Group would address sooting (and, in response to a question, lead and volatile organic compounds), and be co-chaired by a candle manufacturer representative and another representative, perhaps from a test laboratory. George Pappas volunteered to take the lead with the sooting Task Group, and asked for volunteers.

The next Subcommittee meeting will likely be in September or November, 1999, possibly in San Antonio.